

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Stephen J. MEYER et al.)	Confirmation No: 9428
)	
Application No.: 09/196,680)	Group Art Unit: 3752
)	
Filed: November 20, 1998)	Examiner: Christopher S. KIM

For: ORDINARY HAZARD EXTENDED COVERAGE SIDEWALL SPRINKLERS AND SYSTEMS

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

INTERVIEW SUMMARY PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b)

Sir:

Applicants and applicants' representative, David W. Laub, thank the Examiner for the telephonic interviews of December 12, 2011 and December 13, 2011. As to the subject matter of the interview and further to the Examiner's Interview Summary dated December 13, 2011, applicants' representative submits the following Interview Summary pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b); MPEP 713.04:

A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted:

None.

(B) Identification of the claims discussed:

With regard to the December 12 interview, pending claims 1 and 64.

With regard to the December 13 interview, pending claim 1.

(C) Identification of specific prior art discussed;

With regard to the December 12 interview, Bosio, Tramm, and Fischer.

With regard to the December 13 interview, the art of record and in particular U.S. Patent No. 4,014,388 to Anderson ("Anderson").

(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner;

With regard to the December 12 interview, the Examiner proposed further amendments to clarify that claim 1 recites a single flow opening. Applicants maintained, as already stated in the record, that claim 1 already recites an extended coverage sidewall automatic fire sprinkler with a deflector having a single flow opening. However, in order to advance prosecution, Applicants agreed to provide the Examiner with a proposed supplemental amendment further clarifying that claim 1 recites that there is only a single flow opening. The Examiner indicated that he intended to review the art again with regard to deflectors with a single flow opening.

With regard to the December 13 interview, the Examiner reported that he identified the Anderson reference that shows and describes in Figs. 6-9 a single flow opening in a deflector. Applicants brought to the Examiner's attention that the Anderson sprinkler did not show or describe the features of claim 1 as a whole. Anderson fails to provide a direct connection between its yoke arms and its deflector, and instead interposes a spring 24 and rods 40. *See* Anderson at col. 5, lines 30-39. Furthermore, Applicants pointed out that Anderson fails to show or describe that his concealed sprinkler is an extended coverage sprinkler effective for control of ordinary hazard fires. Applicants also pointed out that because Anderson discloses a concealed sprinkler that utilizes spring 24 and rods 40 to position the deflector in various positions distal to the yoke arms of the sprinkler, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the spring 24 and sliding rods 40 of Anderson with the teachings of Bosio, Tramm, or Fisher which have deflectors that have multiple flow openings in which the deflector is directly connected to a yoke member. Applicants thus maintained at the interview that the Anderson reference, alone or in combination with the art of record, did not show or describe the sprinkler of claim 1 when read as a whole. Nonetheless, to advance prosecution, Applicants and

the Examiner came to agreement on an amendment to claim 1 reciting that the yoke has a knuckle with a boss, and that the boss extends through the single face portion opening.

(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner;

See (D) above.

(F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed;

None.

(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview;

Agreement was reached. This statement is being filed with a Supplemental Amendment to incorporate the changes agreed upon by both the Examiner and Applicants.

(H) In the case of an interview via electronic mail, a paper copy of the Internet e-mail contents MUST be made and placed in the patent application file as required by the Federal Records Act in the same manner as an Examiner Interview Summary Form, PTOL 413, is entered.

Not applicable.

CONCLUSION

The above provides a summary of the substance of the telephonic interview between Applicants' representative, David W. Laub, and Examiner Christopher S. Kim on December 12, 2011 and December 13, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DWL', is written over a horizontal line.

David W. Laub
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 38,708

Date: December 15, 2011

Perkins Coie LLP
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-
Telephone: 202.654-6200
Facsimile: 202.654-6211

CUSTOMER NO: 60708